

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks the Office for the attention accorded the present Application in the Action dated November 09, 2007. Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of the subject application as amended herein.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

In that Action, Claims 25- 52 are pending. Claim 26, 28, 30, 35, 36, 41, 44-46 and 52 have been amended. No new matter has been entered.

Claims 26, 28, 30, 35, 36, 41, 44, 45, 46, and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Par.2 (hereinafter “Section 112, Par. 2”) as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter.

Claims 25-32,35-40,42,44,48-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) (hereinafter “Section 102(b)”) as being anticipated by Sonnenfeld (U.S. Pat. 6112049, hereinafter “Sonnenfeld”).

Claims 33-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (hereinafter “Section 103(a)”) as being unpatentable over Sonnenfeld in view of O’Brien. (U.S. Pat. 6651071, hereinafter “O’Brien”).

Claims 41 and 45 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonnenfeld in view of Blonder. (U.S. Pat. 5760771, hereinafter “Blonder”).

Claim 46 was rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonnenfeld in view of Blonder and further in view of O’Brien.

Claim 43 was rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonnenfeld in view of Budra. (U.S. Pat. 6726486, hereinafter “Budra”).

Claim 47 was rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonnenfeld in view of Parry (U.S. Pat. 6077085, hereinafter “Parry”).

Claim 50 was rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonnenfeld in view of Lundberg. (U.S. Pat. 5980264, hereinafter “Lundberg”).

Claim 51 was rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonnenfeld in view of Parry and further in view of Sweitzer (U.S. Pat. 6018617, hereinafter “Sweitzer”).

Claim 52 was rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonnenfeld in view of Naughton (U.S. Pat. 6154209, hereinafter "Naughton").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests reconsideration for all pending claims in light of the remarks below.

II. 35 U.S.C. §112 REJECTIONS

In Para 2 of the Action, the Office rejected claims 26, 28, 30, 35-36, 41, 44, 45-46, 52 under Section 112, Par. 2 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter

In Para 3, the Office has rejected claims 26, 28, 30, 35, and 45, stating that the phrase "like" renders the claims indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "like"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable.

The Applicant respectfully agrees with the Office and proposes to amend the claims 26, 28, 30, 35, and 45 accordingly. The currently amended claims are submitted herewith.

1. In Para 4, the Office has rejected claim 35 stating that it is not clear whether the module is for allowing the user to create or print tests or quizzes or combination for both.

In Claim 35, the applicant would like to suggest to the Office that the claimed system comprises of a Create a Test/Quiz Module and an Insta Test/Quiz Module which allow the user to create both tests and quizzes by various classifications like to the Date of test/quiz, Venue, Name of test/quiz, Categories and Sub-categories, and further allowing the user to assign marks to each question, using the data from the databank, by finding the same, by none or one or more "FIND" conditions. From the claim, it is to be inferred that it is the user's discretion whether he/she decides to create a 'test' or a 'quiz' or both.

As such, to overcome the rejection claim 35 has been amended to read as shown below:

“The system according to claim 25 wherein the modules include a Create a Test or Quiz Module and an Insta Test or Quiz Module for allowing the user to create tests or quizzes manually or automatically and print the said tests or quizzes by various classifications including but not limited to the Date of test or quiz, Venue, Name of test or quiz, Categories and Sub-categories, and further allowing the user to assign marks to each question, using the data from the databank, by finding the same, by none or one or more "FIND" conditions.”

2. The office has rejected claim 41 stating that, it is not clear whether the claimed limitations including animation or sound files, or associate more information to a record or combination of both.

In claim 41, the applicant would like to suggest to the office that the claimed system comprises of a Global Changes Module that allows a user to attach files to a record. These files can either be image, animation, as well as sound files. Here, the attaching utility is analogous to attaching files to an e-mail message.

Further, the Global Changes Module also allows a user to associate more information to a record in the form of URLs (Uniform Resource Locators), files and remarks. In this case, the files could be of any valid format including but not limited to image, animation, or sound files. Here, the association utility is analogous to correlating files on a computer system regarding the same/similar topic and grouping them together at the same location like for example, say all files (irrespective of their formats) related to the topic “GEOGRAPHY” can be grouped together in one folder.

As such, to overcome the rejection, claim 41 has been amended to read as shown below:

“The system according to claim 25 wherein the modules include a Global Changes Module for allowing the user to modify records, delete records, bookmark records, translate records, attach image, animation or sound files or combinations thereof to a record, associate more information to a record in the form of URLs, files, remarks, or mark records as "Set for Practice" or "Mastered", "Public" or "Private", and "Favourite", individually as well as globally.”

3. The Office has rejected claim 44, stating that it is not clear whether allowing a user to print the reports or graphs or combination of both.

In Claim 44, the applicant would like to suggest to the Office that the claimed system comprises of a Reports Module that allows a user to print both reports and graphs about the data in the databank, by finding the same by none or one or more FIND conditions. From the claim, it is to be inferred that it is the user's discretion whether he/she decides to print a 'report' or a 'graph' or a combination of both.

As such, to overcome the above rejection, claim 44 has been amended to read as shown below:

"The system according to claim 25 wherein the modules include a Reports Module for allowing a user to print reports or graphs or combinations thereof about the data in the databank, by finding the same by none or one or more FIND conditions."

4. The Office has rejected claim 46, it is not clear whether a specified number of days or specified number of times or based on a score in a self-evaluation test or combination of both.

In Claim 46, the applicant would like to suggest to the Office that the claimed system allows the user to find questions in the databank. For this, the user needs to specify none, or one or more "FIND" conditions. In case, the user has specified no "FIND" condition and chooses to proceed, then all the questions in the databank will be brought forth in the Find Result. In case, the user has specified one or more "FIND" conditions, then the questions will be brought forth in the Find Result according to these conditions. Like for example, if the user has chosen to find questions classified under the subject "SCIENCE", then only such questions will be brought forth in the Find Result.

The applicant would like to suggest to the Office that the user could specify any of the above "FIND" conditions or specify a combination of one or more of the above "FIND" conditions, to avoid questions to be brought forth in the Find Result.

Further, the invention allows a user to take self-evaluation tests on the questions in the databank. The details of such tests including the questions that appeared in the same, and further the scores obtained by the user in the same are stored for future reference. Thus the user has the option to avoid those questions in the Find Result, which have already been

brought forth in a self-evaluation test taken before a certain number of days and/or before a certain number of times the questions have appeared in a self-evaluation test. The user can specify these criteria. Like for example, if the user has taken a test on question numbers 1, 2, and 3 in the databank, before a period of 10 days. Accordingly, the user can specify a "FIND" condition to avoid these questions to be brought forth in the Find Result. Further, the user can also take multiple tests in which question numbers 1, 2, and 3 appear. In this case, the user can accordingly specify a "FIND" condition to avoid these questions to be brought forth in the Find Result.

Further, as mentioned above, the score obtained by the user for answering each question in the test, is stored for future reference. Accordingly, the user can specify a "FIND" condition to avoid those questions in the Find Result, which have appeared in a self-evaluation test and over which the user has obtained a certain score as may be specified by the user.

As such, to overcome the above rejection, claim 46 has been amended as shown below:

"The system according to claim 45, wherein the "FIND" conditions allow the user to avoid questions that may have been faced by the user in a self evaluation test before a specified number of days or for a specified number of times or based on a score or combinations thereof that the user achieved on the questions in a self evaluation test during a specified period of time."

5. The Office has rejected claim 52, it is not clear whether the modules and utilities are adapted within a browser or other viewing or processing programs or combination of both.

In claim 52, the applicant would like to suggest to the Office that the modules and utilities of the system can be adapted to be operated within the interface of a browser as well as other viewing or processing programs.

As such, to overcome the above rejection claim 52 has been amended as shown below:

"The system according to claim 25 wherein the modules and utilities are adapted to be operated within a browser or other viewing or processing programs and to operate on one or more computers, including hand held devices."

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 26, 28, 30, 35-36, 41, 44, 45-46, 52 under Section 112, Par. 2.

III. 35 U.S.C. §102(b) REJECTIONS

In Para 6, the Office has rejected Claims 25-32, 35-40, 42, 44, 48-49 as being anticipated by Sonnenfeld under Section 102(b).

1. Claim 25

The office has rejected claim 25 by stating that Sonnenfeld teaches an interactive system for building, organizing, and sharing one's own databank of questions and answers in a variety of questioning formats using a computer system (column 1 lines 56-60), comprising a user interface (column 3 lines 43-44), well-classified databases to store data user wise including a user database (column 3 lines 46-48), well classified data input, organizing, and management module (column 4 lines 40-44), modules for sharing, invoking, storing, evaluating, and improving one's knowledge using the data from the databank, said data having been selected by a user by "FIND" conditions (column 5 lines 7-8), and a control system acting as a bridge between the user interface and the databases (column 8 lines 46-48).

The Applicant states that Claim 25 of the present invention reads as follows: -

An interactive system for building, organizing, and sharing one's own databank of questions and answers in a variety of questioning formats, on any subject, in one or more languages, using a computer system, comprising of:

- (a) a User Interface;
- (b) one or more well-classified databases to store data user wise including a User Database;
- (c) at least one well classified data input, organizing and management module;

- (d) modules for sharing, invoking, storing, evaluating, and improving one's knowledge on any subject, using the data from the databank, said data having been selected by a user by finding the same by none or one or more "FIND" conditions; and
- (e) a control system acting as a bridge between the User Interface and the databases.

The present invention claims 'An interactive system for building, organizing, and sharing one's own databank of questions and answers in a variety of questioning formats, on any subject, in one or more languages'. The system of the present invention organizes and manages the databank into a well-classified databank with the help of an organizing and managing module and also provides a find condition, which allows User to find the required data based on none, one or more find conditions. The databank of the present invention is classified by classifications including but not limited to date, language, source of information, Age group, difficulty level, subject, sub-subject etc.

The applicant would like to draw attention to column 1 lines 56-60 of Sonnenfeld which teach "an automated testing system allowing design and administration of hierarchical testing scheme. This scheme eases the burden of creating and giving out tests and allows a fine grain of control over testing parameters." From these lines, it can be inferred that the primary aim of Sonnenfeld's invention is to provide an "automated testing system" that will deliver tests to one or more users.

While the present invention's primary motive is to provide "an interactive system for building, organizing, and sharing one's own databank of questions and answers in a variety of questioning formats using a computer system". Column 1 lines 56-60 of Sonnenfeld fail to teach building, organizing and sharing a database of the questions and answers.

Further, the Office has referred to Sonnenfeld as teaching 'a user interface' of Claim 25 of the present invention. The referred column 3 lines 43-44 teach that Sonnenfeld's automated testing system comprises of "a client system" and "a host system". The client system is "directed to human user interface tasks" and the host system is directed to database and application processing tasks. In order to interact with testing system, the user is required

to interact through the interface of the client system. While in case of the invention of the present application, there is no concept of a client and a host.

Further, the Office has referred to column 3 lines 46-48 of Sonnenfeld as teaching the feature 'one or more well-classified database to store data user wise including a user database' of claim 25. According to column 3 lines 46-48 of Sonnenfeld the automated testing system provides a database of the elemental sections ('building blocks') of the test, each including a content portion and a set of parameters.

The Applicant would like to draw attention of the Office to the column 2 lines 27-31 which defines section as consisting of one or more elements, being subject to the "common parameter set". The element in turn may include any number of questions i.e. zero or more. In other words, *Sonnenfeld is limited to the classification of only the particular elemental section of a test*. While in the case of the present invention, the said system comprises of "well-classified databases to store data user wise including a user database". These databases are the reservoirs of an extensible collection of well-classified data of the questions and answers and also include passages along with the questions and answers based on such passages, including translated data. Information with respect to practice sessions, scheduled sessions, self-evaluation tests, insta tests/quizzes, including the performance of the user, and the creation of tests/quizzes is stored in these databases.

Further, in the database of the present invention each question and answer is classified according to date, language, source of information, Age group, difficulty level, subject, sub-subject among other parameters. User information, including the history of past user interaction with the said system is stored in these databases. Configurations made by the user for customization of the said system are stored in these databases. Thus it can be inferred from the above argument that the 'contents' of the database of the automated testing system provided by Sonnenfeld differ from those of the databases of the said system of the present invention.

Further, the Office has referred to column 4 lines 40-44 of Sonnenfeld for teaching the feature 'well classified data input, organizing and management module' of Claim 25 of the present invention. According to column 4 lines 40-44 of Sonnenfeld, the user interacts with a graphic user interface, and thus a pointing device input and keyboard may be employed to

define the response. The stimulus is typically graphic or semantic information displayed on a screen. That is, for interacting with the automated testing system taught by Sonnenfeld, the user will need to use one or more input devices like a pointing device, keyboard and so on. While in case of the invention of the present application, the said system claims a well-classified data input, organizing, and management module and not merely means of user response. This module helps to organize and manage the databank of the questions and answers by allowing the user to classify the data based on date, language, source of information, Age group, difficulty level, subject, sub-subject etc. The Sonnenfeld fails to teach or does not describe such type of module.

The Office has referred to column 5 lines 7-8 of Sonnenfeld as teaching the feature 'modules for sharing, invoking, storing evaluating and improving one's knowledge using the data from the databank, said data having been selected by a user by find conditions' of Claim 25. Column 5 lines 7-8 of Sonnenfeld teaches an Interactive Testing System (ITS) which follows a conceptual hierarchical model as: Test Administrator(s) ->Test Designer(s) ->Test(s) ->Section(s)->Question(s)->Choice(s). The cited hierarchical model shows a process that the system requires to follow for designing the number of the tests by multiple test designers whereas claimed feature of the present invention is a module for sharing, invoking, storing evaluating and improving one's knowledge using the data from the databank and not a hierarchical model.

Further, according to the hierarchical model of Sonnenfeld, there are at least 2 or 3 persons involved such as test administrator and/or test designer, and test taker in the process whereas the present invention involves only a single user. The module claimed in the present invention also allows the user to store, invoke, and improve one's knowledge by allowing to find the data by using find conditions the applicant would like to suggest to the Office that the modules of the present invention are part/ features of the system claimed in claim 25 and is not limited to any hierarchical model.

The Office further cited column 8 lines 46-48 of Sonnenfeld for teaching the element of 'a control system acting as a bridge between the user interface and the databases' of claim 25 of the present invention. Column 8 lines 46-48 of Sonnenfeld teaches an Interactive Testing System (ITS) that allows a person to interactively create (test designer) and give out

tests (test taker) securely on the Internet using a standard web browser interface. That is, a user can create and deliver tests to one or more persons through a "web browser" in a secure manner. The present invention claims a "control system", which acts as a bridge between the user interface and the database and not the web browser. That is, the instructions given by the user through the user interface of the said system are relayed to the databases through the control system. The databases are queried and the appropriate result is then brought forth to the user interface via the control system. Thus the control system acts as a two-way bridge in this case.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." (see MPEP 2131 Anticipation - Application of 35 U.S.C. 102(a), (b), and (e) [R-1])

In view of the above explanation, each and every element as set forth in claim 25 is not found, either expressly or inherently described in Sonnenfeld. The applicant would like to draw attention to the fact the system and method disclosed in Sonnenfeld is only for designing a test and taking the test using Internet or web-browser. It has limited use and cannot be used by a person who is interested to generate his own question-answer databank. Whereas, the present invention provides a system allowing the user to generate or build his own databank of questions and answers. The system allows storing the data of the questions and answers in well-classified manner so as to find and retrieve the same easily. The databank formed by the system can be used to design a test but the use of this system is not limited to designing test for test taker. The system is useful not only for teachers but also students. This system is also useful for the people who would like to store general knowledge in the form of questions and answers.

Hence, in view of the above the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 25 of the present invention is novel and inventive over Sonnenfeld.

2. Claim 26

The office has rejected claim 26 of the present application stating that Sonnenfeld teaches data input organizing and management module allows the user to classify the data by classifications (column 14 lines 20-25).

Claim 26 of the present invention reads as, “The system according to claim 25 wherein said data input organizing and management module allows the user to classify the data by Classifications like Date, Language, Source of Information, Age Group, Difficulty Level, Subject and Sub subjects”.

The office action states that, column 14 lines 20-25 of Sonnenfeld anticipate claim 26 of the present invention. The applicant states that column 14 lines 20-25 of Sonnenfeld teach about “Section Screens”, which are the “web pages that appear when manipulating information for the section(s) of a test”. These sections are the basic building block of tests. The Section Screens allow “tailoring of the test” to meet certain needs. Examples of some “section parameters include section introduction and section question order”. That is, the Section Screens aid the user to customize tests according to his/her needs.

Claim 26 of the present invention teaches a data input organizing and management module that, inter alia, allows the user to classify the data by Classifications like Date, Language, Source of Information, Age Group, Difficulty Level, Subject and Sub subjects. In other words claim 26 refers to a comprehensive classification of a data based on a range of parameters for forming a well classified database. A user of the well classified database of the present invention has a choice of employing a variety of parameters from the well classified database. In case of questions on the Solar System on the subject of SCIENCE, any user may choose to classify the same as Date (‘12/10/2007’), Language (ENGLISH), Source of Information (PETER), Age Group (BEGINNER), Difficulty Level (MEDIUM), Subject (SCIENCE), Sub Subject (ASTRONOMY), Sub Subject (SOLAR SYSTEM). It can be inferred that *customizing/setting parameters* of a test to be created is different in context from classifying a question based on its contents for building up a well classified database of questions and answers. Attention is also drawn to the general fact that any query based on the use of well classified database results in the rapid retrieval of a small set of relevant results as compared to a relatively large set of results retrieved from less classified data, such results may or may not being relevant. The purpose of classification is quick and efficient retrieval of a relevant set of find results, which cannot be satisfied by a limitation of the classification parameters as observed in the cited prior art of Sonnenfeld. Hence the applicant respectfully

disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 26 of the present invention is novel and inventive over Sonnenfeld.

3. Claim 27

The office has rejected claim 27 by stating that, column 15 line 56 of Sonnenfeld teaches the modules including a question bank-rapid entry module for allowing the user to build questions and answers rapidly by minimum classifications (column 15 line 56).

Claim 27 of the present invention reads as, “The system according to claim 25 wherein the modules include a Question Bank--Rapid Entry Module for allowing the user to build questions and answers rapidly by minimum classifications”.

The applicant states that Office, column 15 line 56 of Sonnenfeld teaches that a test designer can design zero or more tests. In other words, a test designer has the privilege to design as many tests as per his choice. Claim 27 of the present invention teaches a Question Bank – Rapid Entry Module that allows the user to build questions and answers rapidly by minimum classifications. This rapid entry module allows user to build up his well-classified questions-answers database rapidly by making use of the suitable classifications in the database. In the absence of the Rapid entry module, a user has to build a huge number of questions and answers in a given period of time, wherein he would be required to classify each question, and would need to spend a considerable amount of time and effort in this activity. However the Question Bank – Rapid Entry Module of the present invention serves as an efficient interface that helps the user to quickly enter questions along with providing a minimal set of relevant classifications for the same. The user may then, at his/her discretion, choose to give a more comprehensive classification for each question stored in the databank in the Question Bank – Main Module as described in the specification of the present invention. Hence the applicant states that the teaching of column 15 line 56 of Sonnenfeld is entirely different in context from claim 27 of the present invention and claim 27 of the present invention is novel and inventive over Sonnenfeld.

4. Claim 28

The office has rejected claim 28, stating that column 15 lines 56-60 of Sonnenfeld teaches the question bank-rapid entry module allows the user to classify the data by classifications (column 15 lines 56-60).

Claim 28 of the present invention reads as. “The system according to claim 27 wherein said Question Bank--Rapid Entry Module allows the user to classify the data by classifications like Date, Language, Source of Information, Age Group, Difficulty Level, Subject and Sub subjects”.

The applicant states that column 15 lines 56-60 of Sonnenfeld teach that a test designer can design zero or more tests. In other words a test designer has the privilege to design as many tests as per his choice. Further, each test can consist of zero or more test parts. Each test part has zero or more sections, each of which contains zero or more questions. Further, each question has zero or more choices with zero or more of the choices being the correct answer. Column 15 lines 56-60 of Sonnenfeld refers to the designing of the test, which may include zero or more sections, each of which contains zero or more questions.

Claim 28 of the present invention depends upon claim 27, which claims a Question Bank – Rapid Entry Module that allows the user to build questions and answers rapidly by minimum classifications for building a well-classified database of questions and answers. Claim 28 further enriches the classified database which can include but is not limited to classifications based on parameters like Date, Language, Source of Information, Age Group, Difficulty Level, Subject and Sub Subjects, for rapid entry of the questions and answers in the databank. Attention is drawn to the fact that claim 28 does not relate to a designing of the test as taught by column 15 lines 56-60 of Sonnenfeld. Hence the applicant states that claim 28 of the present invention is novel and inventive over Sonnenfeld.

5. Claim 29

The Office has rejected claim 29, stating that column 17 lines 17-24 of Sonnenfeld teaches the modules include a comprehension bank module for allowing the user to build and share a databank of passages by well-defined classifications (column 1 lines 12-14), and

column 2 lines 5-11 teaches questions and answers based on passages in various questioning formats such that the user acquires an improved comprehension of said passages (column 17 lines 17-24).

Claim 29 of the present invention reads as, “The system according to claim 25 wherein the modules include a Comprehension Bank Module for allowing the user to build and share a databank of passages by well-defined classifications, and further questions and answers based on said passages in various questioning formats, such that the user acquires an improved comprehension of said passages”.

The applicant states that, column 17 lines 12-14 of Sonnenfeld teach an element called 'Maintain Your Test(s)' which allows a test designer to design, develop, manage, and give out the tests. The test designer can control every aspect of test design and test taker account management. Further column 2 lines 5-11 of Sonnenfeld teach the concept of building blocks, which can be grouped together to create a question and answer response system. Each building block is independent of the others and contains parameters that determine its functionality and implementation. Each building block also contains information about how it relates to the other building blocks, the few systems, which can be constructed from such 'building blocks'; include educational tests, quizzes, surveys, questionnaires, and trivia quizzes. Further column 17 lines 17-24 of Sonnenfeld teach an element called "View Test Results, Take Tests, or Change Your Personal Information" which allows the test designer to view the test results and to take tests for which a test taker has been assigned. A series of pages is presented which allow the test designer to review tests taken previously, compute grades, and averages based on the tests a test taker has taken, take tests that have been assigned, email the test designer and modify personal account information.

Claim 29 of the present invention claims a Comprehension Bank Module for allowing the user to build and share a databank of passages by well-defined classifications and further questions and answers based on said passages. This module has been provided, keeping in mind the generally accepted fact that several tests and examinations require students to answer questions with reference to the context of a passage. It is also accepted that such evaluation, based on the comprehension of a passage, hones the analytical and cognitive skills of the students and helps teachers to evaluate the students on comprehensive passages.

It can be inferred that column 17 lines 12-14, column 2 lines 5-11, and column 17 lines 17-24 of Sonnenfeld teach that a test designer can control every aspect of test design and further customize the same. These cited lines *do not*, in any way, teach about building and sharing a databank of comprehension “passages by well-defined classifications” and further “questions and answers based on said passages”. Hence, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 29 of the present invention is novel and inventive over Sonnenfeld.

6. Claim 30

The office has rejected claim 30, stating that column 25 lines 28-46 of Sonnenfeld teaches comprehension bank module allows the user to classify the data by well-defined classifications.

Claim 30 of the present invention reads as, “The system according to claim 29 wherein said Comprehension Bank Module allows the user to classify the data by well-defined classifications like Date, Language, Source of Information, Age Group, Difficulty Level, Subject and Sub subjects”. The applicant states that column 25 lines 28-46 of Sonnenfeld teach that each section of a test created by the user has the following information: Section Order #, Section Heading, Section Weight (Relative To 1.0), Number Of Questions In Section, Min # of Qs To Ask Per Diff Lvl, Max # of Qs To Ask Per Diff Lvl, Question Order, Section Time Limit, Min Section Time, Time To Pause After Section, Min Time To Pause After Section, Skeleton For Section, Skeleton For Break After Section, Progressive Test Scores: Passing, Low, High, Next Section Orders For >, < and = To Passing Score.

The present invention claims a Comprehension Bank Module that allows a user to build a databank of passages for comprehension, and further classify the same by well-defined classifications like (1) the Date (the same being generated by the Control System and which can be modified by the user if needed) (2) Language (the language in which the passage has been composed) (3) Source of Information (the Source from where the user obtained the details the user is entering. In case, the passage is based on an article/extract in a particular book/magazine/website, the user can enter the name of this book/magazine/website) (4) Age

Group (the relevant Age Group for which the passage, that the user is entering, is meant for. In case, the passage is on children's fairy tales, then it can be classified under the Age Group 'JUNIORS') (5) Difficulty Level (the level of difficulty of the passage that the user is entering for a particular Age Group. In case, a passage for the Age Group Juniors makes use of complex prose, then it can be classified under the Difficulty Level 'HIGH'), (6) Subject (the Subject under which the passage, that the user is entering, is based upon. a passage on the animal yak may be classified under the subject ANIMAL WORLD), (7) Sub-Subject(s) (the Sub Subject (s) under which the passage that the user is entering is to be classified. A passage on the animal "YAK" may be classified under the subject 'ANIMAL WORLD' and the user may want to further classify the same up to 5 levels {Sub Subjects} Like for example

(SUBJECT>ANIMAL WORLD> SUB SUBJECT1 >TERRESTRIALANIMAL
>SUB SUBJECT2 >MAMMAL >SUB SUBJECT3 >QUADRUPED > SUB SUBJECT4
>HERBIVORE >SUB SUBJECTS >WILD ANIMAL)

The applicant would also like to draw attention to the fact that all of the above mentioned Classifications apply to both the passage as well as the questions and answers based on it.

It can be inferred that column 25 lines 28-46 of Sonnenfeld refers to contents in each section of the test. The column 25 lines 28-46 of Sonnenfeld do not, in any way, teach about building a databank of comprehension passages, and further classifying these passages by well-defined classifications. Hence, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 30 of the present invention is novel and inventive over Sonnenfeld.

7. Claim 31

The office has rejected claim 31, stating that column 26 lines 21-34 of Sonnenfeld teaches the comprehension bank module allows the user to export the questions and answers based on the passages to the data input organizing and management module by "FIND" conditions.

Claim 31 of the present invention reads as, “The system according to claim 29 wherein said Comprehension Bank Module allows the user to export the questions and answers based on the passages to the data input organizing and management module by finding the same from the databank by none or one or more FIND conditions”. The applicant states that column 26 lines 21-34 of Sonnenfeld teaches that when a test designer adds a section, he has two choices – either copy the section and questions over to the new test or link the section and questions over to the new test by creating a reference to the current section. In case, the user chooses to link the section and questions over to the new test, then the questions are maintained at one place and updated in both sections automatically. Else, if the user chooses to copy the section and questions, a completely new section is created with the same questions. Thus in this case, the modifications to questions in one section are not reflected in the other section.

The present invention teaches a Comprehension Bank Module that allows a user to build a databank of passages by well-defined classifications, and further questions and answers based on such passages. The user further has the option to export the questions and answers based on such passages to the data input organizing and management module of the present invention. The data input organizing and management module as mentioned in claim 25 of the present invention allows a user to build, organize, and share one's own databank of questions and answers in a variety of questioning formats, on any subject, in one or more languages.

Thus, the Comprehension Bank Module allows the user to make use of the questions and answers, which he/she might have built on one or more passages, in the data input organizing and management module. As an illustration,, a user might have built a set of questions based on a passage on the topic of ‘Black Holes in Astronomy’. Now, it is possible that out of the set of questions built on the passage, some may pertain strictly to the context of the passage itself, while some may not. The user can make use of none or one or more “FIND” conditions, in order to find the questions, which do not pertain strictly to the context of the passage. The user can make use of such questions in their own right, by exporting them to the data input organizing and management module as taught by claim 25 of the present invention. This would apply to questions built on one or more passages.

Though it is observed from the above arguments that while both column 26 lines 21-34 of Sonnenfeld and claim 31 of the present invention teach copying questions from one module to another and making use of the same simultaneously, it should be noted that the context in which the questions are being copied is entirely different. While Sonnenfeld teaches that the user can make use of the same set of questions in one or more tests, the present invention teaches that the user can transfer questions based on one or more passages in the Comprehension Bank Module to the data input organizing and management module, so that such questions can be used in their own right, despite the passage they were originally based on. One or more questions and answers of the comprehension passages stored in the comprehension passages databank relating to a particular subject can be exported to the question –answers databank by using the module claimed in claim 31. Therefore, the exporting of the present invention claimed in claim 31 is entirely different from the copying of the section and questions over to the new test as taught by Sonnenfeld. Hence, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 31 of the present invention is distinct, novel and inventive over Sonnenfeld.

8. Claim 32

The office has rejected claim 32, stating that column 24 lines 64-67 of Sonnenfeld teaches the modules including a practice session module for allowing the user to invoke and store a practice session for continuous improvement of one's own knowledge on any subject, using the data from the databank by "FIND" conditions.

Claim 32 of the present invention reads as, "The system according to claim 25 wherein the modules include a Practice Session Module for allowing the user to invoke and store a practice session for continuous improvement of one's knowledge on any subject, using the data from the databank by finding the same by none or one or more "FIND" conditions". The applicant states that column 24 lines 64-67 of Sonnenfeld teach that a test designer can make use of a 'Try' option, which will allow him/her to view a preview of the test, as it will appear to a person who will be taking that test.

The present invention teaches a Practice Session Module, that will allow a user to invoke and store a Practice Session for continuous improvement of one's knowledge on any subject, using the data from the databank by finding the same by none or one or more "FIND" conditions. This module allows the user to find the questions of a particular subject, which he/she wishes to practice, by none, or one or more "FIND" conditions, and then invoke the Practice Session. A Practice Session enables a user to have a thorough 're-cap' of the questions so that he/she is better prepared before facing a test.

It can be clearly inferred from the above arguments that column 24 lines 64-67 of Sonnenfeld teach that a test designer can watch a 'preview' of a test as it will appear when given to a test taker, while claim 32 of the present invention claims a Practice Session module which enables to store and invoke the practice session. In the former case, the test designer can choose to watch a preview of the test, only for the purpose of verifying whether the test taker will correctly view it. While in the present invention, the user is taking a Practice Session for the purpose of revising himself/herself over a certain set of questions before taking a test. It is clear that storing and invoking a practice session is entirely different from viewing a test paper for ascertaining the appearance of the test.. Thus, it can be observed that the context in both cases is entirely different. Hence, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 32 of the present invention is distinct, novel and inventive over Sonnenfeld.

9. Claim 35

The office has rejected claim 35, stating that column 8 lines 46-48 of Sonnenfeld teaches the modules including a create a test/quiz module, and column 30 lines 55-65 teach an insta test/quiz module for allowing the user to create, print tests/quizzes manually or automatically, by various classifications (column 2 lines 2-20), and column 39 lines 47-55 further allow the user to assign marks to each question, by "FIND" conditions.

Claim 35 of the present invention reads as, "The system according to claim 25 wherein the modules include a Create a Test/Quiz Module and an Insta Test/Quiz Module for allowing the user to create and/or print tests and/or quizzes manually or automatically, by various

classifications like the Date of test/quiz, Venue, Name of test/quiz, Categories and Sub-categories, and further allowing the user to assign marks to each question, using the data from the databank, by finding the same, by none or one or more "FIND" conditions".

The applicant states that column 8 lines 46-48 of Sonnenfeld teach an Interactive Testing System (ITS) which allows a person to interactively create and give out tests securely on the Internet using a standard web browser interface. Further, column 30 lines 55-65 of Sonnenfeld teach that browsers (and many servers) cache received web pages and often these may be printed. If such possibilities pose significant threat to security of the data accessed through these web pages, then the data could be encrypted using some of the known protocols. This would limit the interception and appropriation of content during transit. Thus, instead of the data directly being accessed through the browser, it would be accessed through a 'helper' application. Though this application allows the user to interface with the system, it however blocks printing or saving of the file, and optionally blocks operating system level misdirection of the data, such as by a Windows screen print utility. Further, column 2 lines 2-20 of Sonnenfeld teach that to overcome the difficulties of the prior art, it provides logical units (i.e. 'building blocks') within an overall presented information stimulus, volitional response system. These building blocks can be grouped together in various sequences to create a question and answer response system. Each building block is independent of the others and contains parameters that determine its functionality and implementation. Each building block also contains information about how it relates to the other building blocks. Such building blocks can be used to construct systems like educational tests, quizzes, surveys, questionnaires, and trivia quizzes. Also, any other system that can be formulated as a sequence of questions and answers can also be built from these building blocks. Each such building block has a set of parameters which define, for example, an interrelation of that section with other sections; grading instructions; adaptive aspects; allowable timing, sequencing and repetition; security; and randomization.

Further, column 39 lines 47-55 of Sonnenfeld teach that the user is provided with a 'List Questions' utility that allows him/her to find questions which contain the same sequences of characters as per the keywords specified by him/her. While finding such questions, it is not necessary that the find results bring matches that are case-sensitive.

However, the user will need to specify the exact HTML (Hyper Text Markup Language) tag as may have been embedded by the test designer in the question, for getting a satisfactory find result. The list of questions thus found, will be brought forth accordingly in the "List of Section Questions" screen that appears next.

While claim 35 of the present invention teaches the Create a Test/Quiz Module and the Insta Test/Quiz Module which allow the user to create and/or print tests and/or quizzes manually or automatically, by various classifications like the Date of test/quiz, Venue, Name of test/quiz, Categories and Sub-categories, and further allowing the user to assign marks to each question, using the data from the databank, by finding the same, by none or one or more "FIND" conditions.

The Create a Test/Quiz Module allows the user to create a Test/Quiz by well-defined Criteria. If the user chooses to create a new Test/Quiz, the Control System brings forth a user interface which prompts the user to copy the current Test/Quiz, facing the user, in terms of data input fields comprising of the Header (Test/Quiz Criteria), Question Details, and/or Attachment/Association(s), such "Copy Current Entry" utility being of immense use to the user to simplify the creation of Tests/Quizzes having at least common Criteria. If a user selects to copy the Header (Test/Quiz Criteria), then the Criteria, by which the current Test/Quiz facing the user was created, will be copied. As an illustration, if a user has created a Test/Quiz by the following Criteria: TEST/QUIZ NAME: UNIT TEST, TEST/QUIZ VENUE: HALL OF FAME, CATEGORY: GEOGRAPHY, SUB CATEGORY1>MOUNTAIN RANGES OF THE WORLD>SUB CATEGORY2>GRADE8>SUB CATEGORY3>DIVISION "A">SUB CATEGORY4>FIRST SEMESTER>SUB CATEGORY5>UNIT TEST

And the new Test/Quiz being created by the user also happens to fall under the above Criteria, the "Copy Current Entry" utility would make the creation of the new Test/Quiz easier for the user, in that; the user would not have to reassign the same Criteria to the new Test/Quiz. If a user selects to copy the Question Details, the questions used in the current Test/Quiz facing the user will be copied. If a user selects to copy the Attachment/Associations to a Test/Quiz, then the Attachment/Associations of the current Test/Quiz facing the user will be copied. If a user chooses not to use this "Copy Current Entry" utility, then the Control

System gets notified and blanks out all the relevant data input fields for new data input by the user. When the user is creating a Test/Quiz, the user has to enter/select the Test/Quiz Criteria, which are described above. The user can also find the available hierarchy(s) of Category and Sub-Categories by which the Tests/Quizzes created earlier are stored in the Database(s). The user can use this hierarchy for new Tests/Quizzes.

The user can also Attach/Associate File(s), URL(s), Remark(s) to the Test/Quiz. The user can open and view the Attached/Associated File(s) when the user is creating a Test/Quiz and even while Navigating between Tests/Quizzes stored in the Database(s).

Further, it is mandatory for a user to add Question(s) to a Test/Quiz. The Control System takes the user to a User Interface from where the user can add questions to a Test/Quiz, assign marks per Question, remove questions from a Test/Quiz, as well as choose to save the Test/Quiz. For the purpose of adding questions to the Test/Quiz, the user has to first find the same from the Database(s). The user can find Questions with or without a backtracking utility provided by the Module. The backtracking utility allows the user to avoid Questions, which have been used in Tests/Quizzes created earlier with the same Test/Quiz Criteria as of the current Test/Quiz being created, by the user, in order to avoid duplication.

If the user wishes to Modify an existing Test/Quiz in this Module, all the utility(s)/functionality(s) available at the time of creating a Test/Quiz would be available to the user and using the same, the user can make further modifications in the Test/Quiz if required.

The user can further Delete Tests/Quizzes, Go to a Test/Quiz and Navigate between Tests/Quizzes, Bookmark Tests/Quizzes, Mark Tests/Quizzes as "Set for Practice" or "Mastered", "Public" or "Private" as well as "Favourite", Print Tests/Quizzes by various Print conditions including printing of Flash Cards, Snap Cards, and Worksheets, Send Record (Question/Answer) as SMS/MMS and/or Network Messaging and/or via Email. Further, the user can export an entire Test/Quiz as a Database File along with the questions and Test/Quiz criteria.

In case where the user selects to create a Test/Quiz automatically, the Control System brings forth a User Interface where the user is asked to provide minimum information like the Language, Test/Quiz Date, Name, Venue, Category, Sub-Category(s), Number of Questions

per specified FIND condition, marks per Question, and whether or not the user wishes to apply the backtracking check while finding Question(s) for the Test/Quiz. After this, the Control System randomly selects the Questions for the Test/Quiz from the Database(s) according to the “FIND” conditions specified by the user. All other utilities/functionalities available to a user in case of a Test/Quiz created manually are also available in case of a Test/Quiz created automatically.

Further, claim 35 of the present invention teaches the Insta Test/Quiz Module which allows the user to print an Insta Test/Quiz. This module allows the user to select the Language in which the Test/Quiz is to be printed, enter/select criteria like Group Name, Insta Test/Quiz Title, Insta Test/Quiz Date, Insta Test/Quiz format, and the No. of Questions to be used in the Insta Test/Quiz . The user can select between Random or Selective printing of the Insta Test/Quiz (in case of selective printing, the user can sort, filter, and select the questions), print an Insta Test/Quiz with Answers and/or without Answers using questions found by none or one or more “FIND” conditions, print details of the selected criteria as well as description (header and footer details), print an Insta Test/Quiz that was printed earlier, and print an Insta Test/Quiz with the same criteria as used for an Insta Test/Quiz printed earlier.

Though both column 8 lines 46-48 of Sonnenfeld and claim 35 of the present invention teach that a user can create tests, it should be noted from the above arguments that the method in which tests are created are entirely different in the two inventions. While Sonnenfeld teaches that a test designer create a test using internet and a test taker(s) give out tests on the Internet, the present invention teaches that a user has to create tests/quizzes to be taken on his own computer system from a well classified database by using various find conditions, as well as in a printed format.

Further, from the above arguments it is obvious that column 30 lines 55-65 of Sonnenfeld teach about overcoming the ‘caching’ feature of a web browser and thus is entirely out of context with claim 35 of the present invention. Further, from the above arguments it should be noted by the Office that column 2 lines 2-20, and column 39 lines 47-55 of Sonnenfeld do not explicitly teach classifying of tests/quizzes, assigning marks to each question, and further finding questions to be used in a test/quiz by “FIND” conditions, as taught by claim 35 of the present invention. Hence, the applicant respectfully disagrees with

the Office and maintains that Sonnenfeld does not anticipate claim 35 of the present invention.

10. Claim 36

The office has rejected claim 36, stating that column 5 lines 32-33, column 5 lines 24-25 and column 21 lines 45-47 of Sonnenfeld teaches the create a test/quiz module enables verifying, using a backtracking utility, whether any of the questions being selected for the test/quiz, have been used during any user specified earlier period for the person(s) who will face the test/quiz, avoiding duplication of questions.

Claim 36 of the present invention reads As, “The system according to claim 35 wherein the Create a Test/Quiz Module enables verifying, using a backtracking utility, whether any of the questions being selected for the test/quiz, have been used during any user specified earlier period for the person(s) who will face the test/quiz, thus avoiding duplication of questions”. The applicant states that, column 5 lines 32-33 of Sonnenfeld teach an Interactive Testing System that disallows "reloading" of prior test parts by using the "reload" button on a standard web browser, Further column 5 lines 24-25 of Sonnenfeld teach that the computation of how much cumulative time has been spent on different parts of a test, is allowed. Further, column 21 lines 45-47 of Sonnenfeld teach that sections are not repeated on a test until all the sections have been given, as with the questions.

While claim 36 of the present invention claims the Create a Test/Quiz Module which provides a “*backtracking utility*” that allows the user to verify whether “any of the questions being selected for a test or quiz, have been used during any user specified earlier period for the person(s) who will face the test or quiz, *thus avoiding duplication of questions.*” (emphasis added). The user can select the appropriate Test/Quiz Criteria for backtracking. In other words, if the user wishes to avoid questions that have been used in Tests/Quizzes created over a certain period of time, the user can do so by selecting the appropriate dates in the `From Date` and `To Date` fields in the relevant User Interface. After this selection, if the user finds the questions to be added to the Test/Quiz, then the Control System will check for questions that have been used in Tests/Quizzes created between the dates specified in the

`From Date` and `To Date` fields by the user, and will avoid displaying such questions in the find result. Further, if the user is creating a Test/Quiz for a certain target audience and wishes to avoid questions that have been used in Tests/Quizzes created earlier for the same target audience, then the user must select to include the name of the target audience for the purpose of backtracking. After this selection, if the user proceeds to find the questions to be added in the Test/Quiz, then the Control System will check for questions that have been used in Tests/Quizzes created earlier for the target audience `XYZ`, and avoid displaying such questions in the find result. The same applies in case where the user selects to include other Test/Quiz Criteria like Test/Quiz Venue, Category and 5 Sub Categories. The user can select to include all or specific Test/Quiz Criteria for backtracking. The user is also allowed to undo such selections.

The Office may please note that Sonnenfeld refers to stopping reloading of a test to avoid cheating to be done by test taker whereas the backtracker utility of the present invention allows the user who may be a teacher i.e. test designer to avoid duplication or repetition of the question(s) that will appear in the test.

From the above arguments, it is obvious that column 5 lines 32-33, column 5 lines 24-25, and column 21 lines 45-47 of Sonnenfeld do not teach the “backtracking utility” as claimed by claim 36 of the present invention. Hence the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 36 of the present invention is distinct, novel, and inventive over Sonnenfeld.

11. Claim 37

The office has rejected claim 37, stating that column 10 lines 21-23 of Sonnenfeld teaches the modules including a scheduler module for allowing the user to schedule data by “FIND” conditions, and said data is brought up on the user’s computer system at preset time intervals.

Claim 37 of the present invention reads as, “The system according to claim 25 wherein the modules include a Scheduler Module for allowing the user to schedule data by finding the

same, from the databank, by none or one or more "FIND" conditions, and said data is brought up on the user's computer system at preset time intervals".

The applicant states that column 10 lines 21-23 of Sonnenfeld teach an Interactive Testing System that, inter alia, provides a security feature that allows a test designer to decide who can take his/her test(s), the number of times they can take them and when they can take them. While, the present invention teaches a Scheduler Module that allows the user to schedule data by finding the same, from the databank, by none or one or more "FIND" conditions, and said data is brought up on the user's computer system at preset time intervals. This utility is provided, so as to enable the user to do a 'quick' revision of the questions from the databank of the present invention. This is especially useful in a scenario where the user might be pre-occupied with some other activity on his/her computer and cannot devote a considerable amount of time for practicing and evaluating himself/herself over the questions through the various modules of the present invention. The Scheduler Module of the present invention allows the user in overcoming this inability, by helping him/her decide what kind of questions he/she wishes to view, by finding the same by none or one or more "FIND" conditions, and set the time intervals at which these questions are to be displayed on the user's computer.

It can be inferred from the above arguments that the teaching of column 10 lines 21-23 of Sonnenfeld is entirely different in context from that of claim 37 of the present invention. Hence, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 37 of the present invention is distinct, novel and inventive over Sonnenfeld.

12. Claim 38

The office has rejected claim 38, stating that column 6 lines 1-3 of Sonnenfeld teaches the modules include an export module for allowing the user to export data from the databank, said data having been selected by the user by "FIND" conditions.

Claim 38 of the present invention reads as, "The system according to claim 25 wherein the modules include an Export Module for allowing the user to export data from the databank,

said data having been selected by the user by finding the same by none or one or more "FIND" conditions".

The applicant states that column 6 lines 1-3 of Sonnenfeld teach an Interactive Testing System that allows sections of a test to be copied to other tests, and further questions in a test section to be copied to other sections on different tests. That is, test sections as well as the questions can be 're-used' in one or more tests. The present invention claims an Export Module, which allows a user to export data from the other's databank. Further, the user can select the data and export in own databank. This module thus enables the user to share questions among his/her peers, friends, relatives, and the like. In case of two users, one having quality questions on the subject of Physics, while the other having quality questions on the subject of Chemistry. These two users can share their questions with each other through their respective Export Modules, thereby mutually benefiting each other. The user can export questions in various formats including but not limited to a Database File and/or as SMS/MMS and/or via Email and/or Network Messaging. The questions exported by a user will append the databank of the importing user.

It can be inferred from the above arguments that the copying of section and pasting of the section as taught by Sonnenfeld is entirely different in context from exporting data from one's databank to user's databank as claimed in claim 38 of the present invention. Hence, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 38 of the present invention is distinct, novel and inventive over Sonnenfeld.

13. Claim 39

The Office has rejected claim 39, stating that column 9 line 20 of Sonnenfeld teaches the modules include an import module for allowing the user to import data built by one or more other users.

Claim 39 of the present invention reads as, "The system according to claim 25 wherein the modules include an Import Module for allowing the user to import data built by one or more other users". It is clear that, column 9 line 20 of Sonnenfeld provides a teaching that parts of tests can be re-used in other tests. The present invention teaches an Import Module

that allows a user to import data built by one or more other users. Extending the argument presented in the reply for claim 38 above, the applicant would like to clarify that the Import Module enables a user to import questions that have been exported by other users, so that the questions append to his/her respective databank.

It can be inferred from the above arguments that column 9, line 20 of Sonnenfeld teaches reusing a test which is different from the import module feature claimed in claim 39 of the present invention. Hence, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 39 of the present invention is distinct, novel and inventive over Sonnenfeld.

14. Claim 40

The office has rejected claim 40, stating that column 9 lines 33-36 of Sonnenfeld teaches the import module further includes a utility for selectively importing the data.

Claim 40 of the present invention reads as, “The system according to claim 39 wherein the Import Module further includes a utility for selectively importing the data”. The applicant states that column 9 lines 33-36 of Sonnenfeld teach that a test designer, for the purpose of creating tests, can choose questions randomly from a pool of questions, ask a fixed set of questions, and re-use questions and answers from previously designed tests.

The present invention teaches an Import Module that allows a user to import data built by one or more other users and further selectively import the data. Extending the argument presented in the reply for claims 38 and 39 above, the Import Module further allows the user to make a selection of the questions that he/she wishes to import into his/her respective databank. In case a user is importing a set of questions that have been exported by another user, he/she may not need the entire set, but only a few questions, which would be useful. Rather the import of the entire set might be cumbersome. Therefore, the selective import of the specific questions is convenient leading to a reduction in time and effort and increases the efficiency in this case.

Thus, it can be inferred from above arguments that the teachings of column 9 lines 33-36 of Sonnenfeld are entirely different in context from that of claim 40 of the present

invention. Hence, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 40 of the present invention is distinct, novel and inventive over Sonnenfeld.

15. Claim 42

The office has rejected claim 42, stating that Sonnenfeld teaches the data input organizing and management module further includes a utility for copying of existing classification and previously entered data, for new data input by the user (column 26 lines 30-32), for ease of data entry, with a choice of defining the extent of the details to be copied (column 45 lines 63-67 and column 46 lines 1-6).

Claim 42 of the present invention reads as, "The system according to claim 25 wherein said data input organizing and management module further includes a utility for copying of existing classification and previously entered data, for new data input by the user, for ease of data entry, with a choice of defining the extent of the details to be copied".

The applicant states that, column 26 lines 30-32 of Sonnenfeld teach that copying a previously created test section over makes a completely new test section with the same questions. Further column 45 lines 63-67 and column 46 lines 1-6 of Sonnenfeld teach about the "Copy A Question From A Test" Screen, from which the test designer can `copy` the question and associated choices from this test to the current section. When the test designer `copies` a previously designed question, the question is duplicated (copied completely) over to the new question being created. Copying the previously created question over makes a completely new question with the same choices. Modifying the question has no effect on the other question from which it was copied (and visa-versa).

Claim 42 of the present invention teaches a utility that allows the user to copy existing *classification* and previously entered data, for new data input by the user, for ease of data entry, with a choice of defining the extent of the details to be copied. This copy feature of the present invention is different from the copying of a question taught by Sonnenfeld. In case a user is building a question in the data input organizing and management module, the Control System brings forth a User Interface which prompts the user to copy the current Question and Answer if any, facing the user, in terms of data input fields comprising of the Header

(Classifications), question, answer and remarks, questioning formats, and/or attachment/associations, such "Copy Current Entry" utility being of immense use to the user to simplify the building of questions and answers having at least common classifications. If a user selects to copy the Header (Classifications), then the Classifications, under which the current question facing the user is classified, will be copied. As an illustration,, if a user has an existing question classified as:

AGE GROUP: GENERAL, DIFFICULTY LEVEL: HIGH, SUBJECT: ANIMAL
WORLD, SUB SUBJECT1>TERRESTRIAL ANIMAL>SUB
SUBJECT2>MAMMAL>SUBSUBJECT3>QUADRUPED>SUBSUBJECT4>HERBIVORE
>SUB SUBJECT5>WILD ANIMAL

And the new question being built by the user also happens to be falling under the above Classifications, the "Copy Current Entry" utility would make the new entry easier for the user, since the user would not have to reclassify the new question entry. If a user selects to copy the question, answer and remarks, and questioning formats, the current question, answer and remarks and questioning formats, facing the user will be copied. If a user selects to copy the files and/or URLs (Uniform Resource Locators) attached/associated to the current question facing the user, then the same will be copied accordingly. This also applies in case the user wishes to build a passage through the Comprehension Bank Module as taught by claim 29 of the present invention, and further one or more questions based on this passage.

From the above arguments, it should be noted by the Office that the teachings of column 26 lines 30-32, column 45 lines 63-67 and column 46 lines 1-6 of Sonnenfeld are limited to copying a question which are different from copying the classification as claimed in claim 42 of the present invention. In other words, Sonnenfeld teaches that the user can copy questions and other information from a test to be re-used in another test, while the present invention teaches that if the user is building a question which has the same classifications/criteria as that of a question existing in the databank, then the user can copy one or more details of the latter for ease of data entry. Hence, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains Sonnenfeld does not anticipate that claim 42 of the present invention.

16. Claim 44

The office has rejected claim 44, stating that column 9 lines 56-57, column 30 lines 55-65 and column 61 lines 37-40 of Sonnenfeld teaches the modules include a reports module for allowing a user to print reports, graphs about the data in the databank by FIND conditions.

Claim 44 of the present invention reads as, “The system according to claim 25 wherein the modules include a Reports Module for allowing a user to print reports and/or graphs about the data in the databank, by finding the same by none or one or more FIND conditions”.

The applicant states that, column 9 lines 56-57 of Sonnenfeld teach about monitoring the progress of individual test takers over the years of testing. Further, column 30 lines 55-65 of Sonnenfeld teach that browsers (and many servers) cache received web pages and often these may be printed. If such possibilities pose significant threat to security of the data accessed through these web pages, then the data could be encrypted using some of the known protocols. This would limit the interception and appropriation of content during transit. Thus, instead of the data directly being accessed through the browser, it would be accessed through a ‘helper’ application. Though this application allows the user to interface with the system, it however blocks printing or saving of the file, and optionally blocks operating system level misdirection of the data, such as by a Windows screen print utility. Further, column 61 lines 37-40 of Sonnenfeld teach about a recording level, which can be used to later compute test statistics (score and test time: mean, standard deviation, min, max, mode, etc.) for the test.

Claim 44 of the present invention teaches a Reports Module that allows the user to print various kinds of reports from the data in the databank, including but not limited to List of Questions, List of Questions Count by Classification, Evaluation Report (Individual and Overall) by Classifications like Language, Source of Information, Age Group, Subjects, Difficulty Level etc, Record usage report (details of how often, for a given period, a Record has been brought forth to a user in a Practice Session/Self Evaluation Test/Quiz along with details of the user's performance for that Record), Flash Cards, Snap Cards, Worksheets, and Question details, and User Details. For printing these reports, the user will need to find the questions by none or one or more “FIND” conditions select the appropriate criteria in the relevant user interface and proceed.

From the above arguments, Applicant states that column 9 lines 56-57, column 30 lines 55-65, and column 61 lines 37-40 of Sonnenfeld do not teach the kind of reports and/or graphs as taught by the present invention. Hence, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 44 is distinct, novel, and inventive over Sonnenfeld.

17. Claim 48

The office has rejected claim 48, stating that column 16 lines 17-28 of Sonnenfeld teaches the modules including a tools/help menu options for allowing the user to select an option for customization including system maintenance and updating of database.

Claim 48 of the present invention reads as, “The system according to claim 25 wherein the modules include a Tools/Help Menu Options Module for allowing the user to select an option for customization including system maintenance and updating of database”. The applicant states that column 16 lines 17-28 of Sonnenfeld teach that the tests the test designer creates can be tailored with any desired look and feel, available employing web browser technology on a client machine. The tests can be manipulated with reference to various parameters such as logo (or other graphics) and background of each page in the browser, as well as particulars of each screen of the test.

The present invention teaches a Tools/Help Menu Options Module that allows a user to select an option for customization including “system maintenance and updating of database”. Through this module, the user can customize the database with respect to various parameters including but not limited to backing up, restoring, repairing and compressing the databank, performing a system self check of the user’s computer, startup options, the number of questions to be displayed in a find result grid, the background music played during the Practice Sessions and Tests, options for data entry, options for printing Study-Aids like Flash Cards, Snap Cards, and Worksheets, as well as Question Details, options for the GUI (Graphical User Interface), options for obtaining Voice Output, options for managing Tests and Practice Sessions and so on.

It can be inferred from the above arguments that column 16 lines 17-28 of Sonnenfeld teach about customizing the settings relating to the appearance of test on the desktop of a test

taker, which is entirely different from the system maintenance and updating database of the present invention. Hence, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 48 of the present invention is distinct, novel and inventive over Sonnenfeld.

18. Claim 49

The office has rejected claim 49, stating that column 8 lines 28-30 of Sonnenfeld teaches the modules including a master module for allowing the user to create and store masters for well-defined classifications.

Claim 49 of the present invention reads as, “The system according to claim 25 wherein the modules include a Master Module for allowing the user to create and store masters for well-defined classifications”. The applicant states that column 8 lines 28-30 of Sonnenfeld teach that a test database administrator has the rights to assume the guise of ANY existing test designer and perform ALL the functions associated with that test designer. While, the present invention claims in claim 49 a Master Module, which allows the user to create and store Masters for well-defined classifications. As an illustration, the Subject classification could be considered. Now the user can create and store Masters like ‘HISTORY’, ‘GEOGRAPHY’, ‘SCIENCE’, ‘MATHEMATICS’, and so on for this classification. The same applies in case of other classifications like Info Source, Age Group, Difficulty Level and so on. These Masters could be used to classify one or more questions that the user will be building in the data input organizing and management module discussed in claim 25 of the present invention.

Thus it can be inferred from the above arguments that the teachings of column 8 lines 28-30 of Sonnenfeld are different from that of claim 49 of the present invention. Hence, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 49 of the present invention is distinct, novel and inventive over Sonnenfeld.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 25-32,35-40,42,44,48-49 under Section 102(b).

IV. 35 U.S.C. §103(a) REJECTIONS

1. Claims 33 and 34

In Para 8, the Office has rejected Claims 33-34 under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonnenfeld in view of O'Brien.

In its rejection of claim 33, the office states that Sonnenfeld teaches the invention as discussed above. In addition, Sonnenfeld further teaches print a test module (column 30 lines 55-65), individual test report module (column 9 lines 56-57), and an overall evaluation report module (column 9 lines 59-65). The office states that though Sonnenfeld fails to teach the following claimed limitations as taught by O'Brien: the modules include a self-evaluation test module (column 3 lines 4-6), invoke and store self-evaluation tests (column 6 lines 14-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sonnenfeld's invention in view of O'Brien in order to enable a student to quickly identify where further work is required and the types of courses that will meet the deficient ability levels as taught by O'Brien (column 3 lines 21-23).

Claim 33 of the present invention reads as, "The system according to claim 25 wherein the modules include a Self Evaluation Test Module, Print a Test Module, Individual Test Report Module, and an Overall Evaluation Report Module for allowing the user to invoke and store self evaluation tests, being taken in a variety of test formats using the data from the databank, by finding the same by none or one or more "FIND" conditions, and to print such Tests, and obtaining evaluation reports of said tests".

As mentioned by the Office, column 30 lines 55-65 of Sonnenfeld teach that browsers (and many servers) cache received web pages and often these may be printed. If such possibilities pose significant threat to security of the data accessed through these web pages, then the data could be encrypted using some of the known protocols. This would limit the interception and appropriation of content during transit. That is, instead of the data directly being accessed through the browser, it would be accessed through a 'helper' application. Though this application allows the user to interface with the system, it however blocks

printing or saving of the file, and optionally blocks operating system level misdirection of the data, such as by a Windows screen print utility.

Further column 9 lines 56-57 of Sonnenfeld teach an “Interactive Testing System” (ITS) which allows a test designer to monitor progress of individual test takers over the course of years of testing. Further column 9 lines 59-65 of Sonnenfeld teach that a test designer can automatically generate notes to test takers like students, job applicants, generate notes and periodical report cards at home to parents, provide feedback to upper management on the how people have done in the past.

Further column 3 lines 4-6 of O’Brien teach about a database system wherein a student can submit a self-assessment of her performance which is also retained in the data storage structure. Further, column 6 lines 14-16 of O’Brien teach a student feedback table, which contains a similar set of fields for information relating to the student's self assessment of her performance. Further, column 3 lines 21-23 of O’Brien teach a database system that enables a student to quickly identify where further work is required and the types of courses that will meet the deficient ability levels.

Claim 33 of the present invention teaches the Self Evaluation Test Module, Test Module, Print a Test Module, Individual Test Report Module, and an Overall Evaluation Report Module. The Self Evaluation Test Module allows a user to take tests from the questions in the databank, for the purpose of self-evaluation. The user first has to select the language in which he/she wishes to take the test. Then he/she can find questions for the test, by none or one or more “FIND” conditions. Further, the user can choose to take the test in one or more formats including but not limited to Multiple Choice, True or False, Fill in the Blanks, Match Maker and so on.

Further the Print a Test Module allows the user to print a test ‘with answers’ as well as ‘without answers’. The user can use the test ‘without answers’ as a worksheet and the test ‘with answers’ as a reference sheet for verifying the answers.

Further, the Individual Test Report Module allows the user to obtain an evaluation report of his/her performance in the test. This report displays the Criteria selected by the user as well as information regarding the self evaluation test selected by the user, grouped according to headers such as no. of questions attempted, no. of questions correctly answered,

and percentage score of the user for a subject. The report also displays the total of no. of questions attempted, total no. of questions correctly answered, and the percentage score.

Further, the Overall Evaluation Report Module allows the user to obtain an overall evaluation report of all the self evaluation tests taken by a user so far, grouped in ascending or descending order by Criteria like subject, age group, difficulty level, source of information, and test title. This report enables the user to evaluate his/her performance over a certain period of time, and over particular criteria.

It should be noted by the Office that column 30 lines 55-65 of Sonnenfeld teach restricting the user to access the print functionality of a web browser as opposed to the Print a Test Module of the present invention where the user can print a test by his/her own accord. Further, though it is accepted that column 9 lines 56-57 and 59-65 of Sonnenfeld and claim 33 of the present invention teach tracking progress of a user in several tests over a period of time, it should be noted from the above arguments that the particulars of the Overall Evaluation Report obtained through the present invention are different from that taught by column 9 lines 59-65 of the present invention.

Further, it should be noted by the Office that column lines 4-6 and column 6 lines 14-16 of O'Brien only teach that a student can submit his/her self assessment to a particular database system. From these teachings, the nature of the self-assessment is not very clear and explicit as compared to that taught by claim 33 of the present invention. That is, O'Brien does not seem to teach any module, which will allow the user to take a test for self-evaluation on a particular subject or criteria.

The applicant agrees with the Office that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sonnenfeld's invention in view of O'Brien in order to enable a student to quickly identify where further work is required and the types of courses that will meet the deficient ability levels as taught by O'Brien (column 3 lines 21-23). However, it should be noted by the Office that modifying Sonnenfeld's invention in view of O'Brien will teach a network based testing system coupled with a database system which stores the results of such tests. The applicant would like to suggest to the Office that the present invention primarily teaches an interactive system that allows the user to build, organize, and share one's own databank of questions and answers in a variety of

questioning formats, on any subject, in one or more languages as claimed in claim 25 which is novel and inventive over Sonnenfeld and O'Brien. Claim 33 depends on claim 25. Further, the present invention also teaches modules for sharing, invoking, storing, evaluating, and improving one's knowledge on any subject, using the data from the databank, said data having been selected by a user by finding the same by none or one or more "FIND" conditions. It can be inferred from these arguments that the interactive system as taught by the present invention cannot be arrived at by modifying Sonnenfeld's invention in view of O'Brien.

Hence the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 33 of the present invention is distinct, novel, and inventive over Sonnenfeld in view of O'Brien.

2. Claim 34

The office has rejected claim 34 as obvious under Section 103(a) stating that, Sonnenfeld teaches the invention as discussed above. In addition, Sonnenfeld further teaches a utility for viewing a replay of a self-evaluation test along with the user's actions performed and to obtain reports of such replays (column 62 lines 46-54).

Claim 34 of the present invention reads as, "The system according to claim 33 where the Self Evaluation Test Module includes a utility for viewing a replay of a self evaluation test along with the user's actions performed during the self evaluation test and to obtain reports of such replays".

The applicant states that column 62 lines 46-54 of Sonnenfeld teach the "Test, Section and Question ("All" or "Playback")" recording level which in addition to the what the "Test and Section" level of recording generates, this recording level can be used to later compute question statistics (averages and means for number right, wrong, no answer, and points) for the test. It can also be used to generate distributions, histograms and plots for the individual questions and choices for a test. The question order number indicates what order the questions were actually given in within the section to the test taker.

Claim 34 of the present invention teaches the Self Evaluation Test Module which allows a user to view a replay of a self-evaluation test along with the user's actions performed during the same. In other words a replay of a test displays the questions that the user faced in

the same along with the Answers that the user gave to each Question as well as the correct Answer. The user can further obtain reports of such replays.

The applicant would like to draw attention to the fact that the method in which a test is "replayed" as in the present invention is different from a "Play Back" of a test as taught by Sonnenfeld. Hence, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 34 of the present invention is distinct over Sonnenfeld in view of O'Brien.

3. Claims 41 and 45

In Para 9, the Office has stated that Claims 41 and 45 are rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonnenfeld in view of Blonder.

The office action states that Sonnenfeld teaches the invention as discussed above. In addition, Sonnenfeld further teaches a global changes module (column 5 lines 9-15), for allowing the user to modify records, delete records, mark records as "Set for Practice" or "Mastered", "Public" or "Private" (column 8 lines 17-31), attach image, animation, sound files, associate more information to a record in the form of URLs, files, remarks, translate records, individually as well as globally (column 5 lines 2-6). However, Sonnenfeld fails to teach the following claimed limitations as taught by Blonder: bookmark records (column 5 lines 12-20), attachment remarks, association remarks, import remarks, or bookmark remarks (column 5 lines 46-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sonnenfeld's invention in view of Blonder in order to provide a system and method for providing a structured, organized tour of hypertext files as taught by Blonder (column 2 lines 42-44).

a. Claim 41 of the present invention reads as, "The system according to claim 25 wherein the modules include a Global Changes Module for allowing the user to modify records, delete records, bookmark records, mark records as "Set for Practice" or "Mastered", "Public" or "Private", and "Favourite", attach image, animation and/or sound files, and/or associate more information to a record in the form of URLs, files, remarks, translate records, individually as well as globally".

As mentioned by the Office, column 9, lines 9-15 of Sonnenfeld teaches an "Interactive Testing System" ("ITS") which uses the following conceptual hierarchical model:

Test Administrator(s).->Test Designer(s).->Test(s).->Section(s).->Question(s).->Choice(s)
Test Administrators.->Test Taker(s)

Test Designer(s).->Test Taker(s)

Test Part: Section.->[Optional Break].->Section.->[Optional Break].->. . .

Further, column 8 lines 17-31 of Sonnenfeld teach an "Interactive Testing System" ("ITS"), which allows a test designer to record the date and time a user takes the test out on, and further allows test designers to: maintain a list of private test takers, create, modify, delete, email, cancel tests outstanding (i.e., previously given out), assign test takers (created by designer or administrator) to take tests created, give out tests to individual users that they create, and further allows test database administrator to become ANY test designer and perform ALL functions associated with that test designer.

Further, column 5 lines 2-6 of Sonnenfeld teach the ability of his invention to give multimedia-based questions that consist of video clips, sound and pictures. It also includes the ability to use the resources on the computer (such as a calculator) and the Internet (such as other web pages) to aid the test taker in taking the test.

Further, column 5 lines 12-20 of Blonder teach a feature of a known browser that presents a list of bookmarks saved by the user from the present or earlier browser sessions. A user can construct a viewing program by storing bookmarks for pages according to a theme, and may revisit any page in the program by selecting its title from the list of bookmarks. This is also entirely driven by the user, provides no information relating the successive pages and is subject to the same problems of surfing. Further, column 5 lines 46-48 of Blonder teach a tour guide which provides information including introductory remarks about the overall structure, theme, and content of the tour.

Further, column 2 lines 42-44 of Blonder teach a system and method for providing a structured, organized tour of Hypertext files for at least one user at a time.

Claim 41 of the present invention teaches the Global Changes Module that allows the user to modify records, delete records, mark records as “Set for Practice” or “Mastered”, “Public” or “Private”, attach image, animation, sound files, associate more information to a record in the form of URLs, files, remarks, translate records, individually as well as globally. This module is provided so as to enable the user to make changes to several records at a time, thereby saving considerable time and effort.

From the above arguments, it is clear that column 5 lines 9-15, column 8 lines 17-31, and column 5 lines 2-6 of Sonnenfeld do not teach a “Global Changes Module” as claimed by the present invention. Further column 5 lines 12-20 of Blonder teach a feature of a web browser that allows the user to bookmark web pages visited. It should be noted by the Office that the present invention teaches a Global Changes Module that allows a user to bookmark one or more records at a time. For this purpose, the user will need to specify the appropriate Bookmark Remarks. This is different in context from the teachings of column 5 lines 12-20 of Blonder.

Further, column 5 lines 46-48 of Blonder teach a tour guide, which provides information including introductory remarks about the overall structure, theme, and content of the tour. This is entirely different in context from the Global Changes Module of the present invention.

The applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 41 of the present invention is distinct, novel, and inventive over Sonnenfeld in view of Blonder.

b. Claim 45

The office has rejected claim 45, stating that Sonnenfeld teaches the invention as discussed above. In addition, Sonnenfeld further teaches the “FIND” conditions are defined by classifications (column 6 lines 26-52), as well as by keywords, separators, file attachments, associations (column 22 lines 52-59), including whether or not a record is marked as “Set for Practice” or “Mastered” or either, “Private” or “Public” or either (column 8 lines 17-31), practice session title, test/quiz title, test/quiz venue, category and sub categories (column 25 lines 28-46).

Claim 45 of the present invention reads as, "The system according to claim 25 wherein the "FIND" conditions are defined by classifications like the Date, Record ID, Language, Source of Information, Age Group, Difficulty Level, Subject, Sub Subjects, Test/Quiz Title, Test/Quiz Venue, Category and Sub Categories as well as by keywords, separators, wildcard characters, file attachments, attachment remarks, associations, association remarks, import remarks, or bookmark remarks including whether or not a record is marked as "Set for Practice" or "Mastered" or either, "Private" or "Public" or either, as well as "Favourite", Practice Session Title, Test/Quiz Title, Test/Quiz Venue, Category and Sub categories".

As mentioned by the Office, column 6 lines 26-52 of Sonnenfeld teach an "Interactive Testing System" which records section information in terms of the section order # within test (can be the same as another section in which case one of the sections will be selected at random), the section heading (also known as the section identifier, label or name), the section introduction, the section ending, the section weight relative to 1.0, the number of questions within the section, the minimum number of questions to ask (within difficulty level if any) on the section, the maximum number of questions to ask (within difficulty level if any) on the section, whether to ask questions in random or sequential order, what order to ask questions within the section in, at one particular difficulty level, by increasing difficulty level, by decreasing difficulty level, by random difficulty level, by Ignoring the difficulty level, what order to ask questions within a difficulty level (if not ignoring difficulty level): Random, or Sequential (order entered).

Further column 22, lines 52-59 of Sonnenfeld teach that skeleton files are HTML files that contain key tag words embedded in the text. They allow the test designer to completely tailor what a test taker's web browser page will look like. The ITS will read in the skeleton file and search for certain keywords. Upon finding the sequence of characters (in this case, "<!--<TEST>-->" (no quotation marks)) in the file, the ITS will substitute any data that it is responsible for providing. Further, column 8 lines 17-31 of Sonnenfeld teach an "Interactive Testing System" ("ITS"), which allows a test designer to record the date and time a user takes the test out on, and further allows test designers to: maintain a list of private test takers, create, modify, delete, email, cancel tests outstanding (i.e., previously given out), assign test takers (created by designer or administrator) to take tests created, give out tests to individual

users that they create, and further allows test database administrator to become ANY test designer and perform ALL functions associated with that test designer. Further, column 25 lines 28-46 of Sonnenfeld teach that every test section is listed with the following information about it: Section Order #, Section Heading, Section Weight (Relative To 1.0), Number Of Questions In Section, Min # Of Qs To Ask Per Diff Lvl, Max # Of Qs To Ask Per Diff Lvl, Question Order, Section Time Limit, Min Section Time, Time To Pause After Section, Min Time To Pause After Section, Skeleton For Section, Skeleton For Break After Section, Progressive Test Scores: Passing, Low, High, Next Section Orders For >, < and = To Passing Score.

Claim 45 of the present invention teaches that user can find records in the databank by none or one or more "FIND" conditions. Depending on the conditions specified by the user, the relevant records are brought forth in the find result. From the records obtained in the find result, the user can perform one or more activities like taking self-evaluation tests, creating and/or printing tests/quizzes, taking practice sessions, printing study aids like flash cards, snap cards, worksheets, and so on.

As an illustration, if the user wishes to find records pertaining to the subject ANIMAL WORLD, the user must enter/select the subject ANIMAL WORLD in the Subject field of the relevant user interface. Similarly, if the user wishes to find records pertaining to the Source of Information 'PETER'S QUESTION BANK', the user must select the same in the Source of Information field of the relevant user interface.

Further, the user can also enter relevant keywords in the keywords field, which would bring forth those records that contain the exact match or part thereof of the keywords. The user can enter more than one keyword and can also choose to include or exclude the whole or part of any keyword. That is, the user can enter one or more words separated by a space in the keywords field, and further the user can add a "+" separator or a "-" separator to include or exclude the subsequent word with respect to the immediately preceding word. Further, the user can find records created and/or modified within a particular Date Range, and by the Record ID.

Further, the user can find Records by a condition like whether or not the Records have been Bookmarked. In case where the Record is Bookmarked, the user can find it by entering

the appropriate Bookmark Remarks that the user may have assigned to the Record at the time of bookmarking the record in the relevant module. The user can find by whether or not the records have been marked as "Public"/"Private" or both, "Set for Practice"/"Mastered" or both, as well as "Favourite". The user can further find records by a condition like whether or not the records have Associations or File Attachments. If the user selects to find Record(s) that have File Attachments, the user must further select the type of the File Attachment as either an Image, Animation, or a Sound file. Further the user can find by entering the relevant Attachment/Association Remarks if any, related to the Attachment/Association of the records. The user can further find records by their Import Remarks, if any, given to the records while they were imported into the databank. The user can also choose to find by more than one master for particular Criteria by using the Custom option. As an example, the user can choose to find records for the Age Groups `JUNIORS` as well as `SENIORS` at a time.

Further, the user can find records by conditions like Accuracy and Frequency of Occurrence. Thus, in case of Accuracy, the user finds records according to the performance of the user on the same in a Self Evaluation Test, and in case of Frequency of Occurrence, the user finds records by whether or not a Question has appeared in a Self Evaluation Test or a Practice Session and if so, the number of times it has appeared, and also the time period in which it has appeared.

The user has the further option to exclude the above by using "FIND" conditions. As an illustration, if the user enters/selects the Subject as ANIMAL WORLD and chooses to exclude the same, the Control System will avoid showing those records classified under the Subject ANIMAL WORLD in the find result. The same applies accordingly in case of the other "FIND" conditions.

From the above arguments, it is obvious that column 6 lines 26-52, column 22 lines 52-59, column 8 lines 17-31, and column 25 lines 28-46 of Sonnenfeld do not teach the "FIND" conditions as taught by claim 45 of the present invention. Hence, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 45 of the present invention is distinct, novel, and inventive over Sonnenfeld in view of Blonder.

4. Claim 46

In Para 10, the office has rejected Claim 46 as obvious under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonnenfeld in view of Blonder and further in view of O'Brien. Sonnenfeld in view of Blonder teaches the invention as discussed above. In addition, Sonnenfeld further teaches the "FIND" conditions allow the user to avoid questions that may have been faced by the user in before a specified number of days and/or for a specified number of times and/or based on a score that the user achieved on the questions during a specified period of time (column 8 lines 8-26).

Claim 46 of the present invention reads as, "The system according to claim 45, wherein the "FIND" conditions allow the user to avoid questions that may have been faced by the user in a self evaluation test before a specified number of days and/or for a specified number of times and/or based on a score that the user achieved on the questions in a self evaluation test during a specified period of time".

The applicant states that, column 8, lines 8-26 of Sonnenfeld teach about Recording test taker statistics and results in terms of "playbacking" any test that a user has taken, recording grades, answers to questions, number of times they have taken the test, allowing taker to see how they did compared to other users, recording the amount of time a user has spent on each part of the test, recording the date and time a user takes the test out on. Further, test designers are allowed to maintain a list of private test takers, create, modify, delete, email and cancel tests outstanding (i.e., previously given out), assign test takers (created by designer or administrator) to take tests created.

Claim 46 of the present invention claims one of the features of the "FIND" conditions as have been discussed in the applicants response to the rejection of claim 45 above, which allows the user to avoid questions that may have been faced by the user before a specified number of days and/or for a specified number of times and/or based on a score that the user achieved on the questions during a specified period of time. This utility is provided to the user so as to enable him/her to keep a track of the questions that he/she may have faced in a previous test and answered correctly. Thus, the user can choose to move on to take the test over the next set of questions. As an illustration, if the user's databank consists of 100

questions and the user has already faced the first 50 questions from this databank and answered them correctly. Now, the user can specify the appropriate “FIND” conditions in the invention of the present applications that will allow him/her to exclude these 50 questions and bring forth the next set of 50 questions in a test.

From the above arguments, it is obvious that column 8 lines 8-26 of Sonnenfeld do not teach or suggest any “FIND” conditions having such a feature which allows the user to avoid questions that may have been faced by the user before a specified number of days and/or for a specified number of times and/or based on a score that the user achieved on the questions during a specified period of time, as taught by the present invention. Hence, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 46 of the present invention is distinct, novel, and inventive over Sonnenfeld in view of Blonder and further in view of O’Brien.

5. Claim 43

In Para 11, the Office has rejected Claim 43 as obvious under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonnenfeld in view of Budra.

The office action states that Sonnenfeld teaches the invention as discussed above. However, Sonnenfeld fails to teach the following claimed limitations as taught by Budra: the modules including a recycle bin module for allowing the user to restore or permanently remove a record individually or plurally from the system (column 9 lines 45-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sonnenfeld’s invention in view of Budra in order to provide a computing device for training a student to categorize words into a plurality of categories as taught by Budra (column 2 lines 42-44).

Claim 43 of the present invention reads as, “The system according to claim 25 wherein the modules include a Recycle Bin Module for allowing the user to restore or permanently remove a record individually or plurally from the system”. The applicants state that, column 9 lines 45-47 of Budra teach a Vocabulary improvement game called Scrap Cat wherein a student is required to select the correct category for a Vocabulary item. Like for

example, the word 'ELEPHANT' will belong to the category 'ANIMALS'. When the student selects the correct category for a word, an illustrative animation happens wherein a crusher drops down and crushes the word, and then shoots the crushed word into the recycling bin associated with the correct category.

Further, column 2 lines 42-44 of Budra teach about providing a computing device for training a student to categorize words into a plurality of categories. While claim 43 of the present invention teaches a Recycle Bin Module, which stores the data deleted from the databank by the user. The user can delete unwanted data from the data input organizing and management module of the present invention. The Recycle Bin Module offers the user the choice of restoring this deleted data or permanently deleting the same.

It can be clearly inferred from the above arguments that the teachings of column 9 lines 45-47 and column 2 lines 42-44 of Budra are entirely different in context with that of claim 43 of the present invention. Hence, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 43 of the present invention is distinct, novel and inventive over Sonnenfeld in view of Budra.

6. Claim 47

In Para 12, the office has rejected Claim 47 as obvious under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonnenfeld in view of Parry.

Sonnenfeld teaches the invention as discussed above. However, Sonnenfeld fails to teach the following claimed limitations as taught by Parry: the modules including a translation module for allowing translation of a record from one language into another of user's choice, individually or globally (column 11 lines 37-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sonnenfeld's invention in view of Parry in order to provide a learning system that can accommodate students with differing native languages as taught by Parry (column 2 lines 44-46).

Claim 47 of the present invention reads as, "The system according to claim 25 wherein the modules include a Translation Module for allowing translation of a record from one language into another of user's choice, individually or globally". The applicant states that,

column 11 lines 37-40 of Parry teach a Guided Translation: wherein multiple columns of words are presented to the student who is prompted to select a word from each column to form a foreign language equivalent of a specified native language phrase. Further, column 2 lines 44-46 of Parry teach a learning system that can accommodate students with differing native languages.

Claim 47 of the present invention teaches a Translation Module that allows the user to translate one or more records “from one language into another of user’s choice”. For this purpose, the user has to find the records from the database by none or one or more “FIND” conditions, sort, filter and select the records in the find result, select/add a language in which the user wishes to translate the records, and then proceed with the translation activity.

It can be inferred from the above arguments that column 11 lines 37-40 of Parry which teach translation of words are different from that of claim 47 of the present invention. Hence, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 47 of the present invention is distinct, novel and inventive over Sonnenfeld in view of Parry.

7. Claim 50

In Para 13, the Office has rejected Claim 50 as obvious under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonnenfeld in view of Lundberg. Sonnenfeld teaches the invention as discussed above. However, Sonnenfeld fails to teach the following claimed limitations as taught by Lundberg: the modules include a screen saver module for allowing the user to display the data in the databank as screen savers (column 2 lines 30-37).

The office action states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sonnenfeld’s invention in view of Lundberg in order to provide a customizable screen saver program that can display information or questions and answers and score the user’s performance as taught by Lundberg (column 1 lines 32-34).

Claim 50 of the present invention reads as, “The system according to claim 25 wherein the modules include a Screen Saver Module for allowing the user to display the data in the databank as screen savers”. Column 2 lines 30-37 of Lundberg teach the operation of the screen saver program in one exemplary foreground mode. A question from a database

containing questions and corresponding answers is displayed. Once an input is received (for example from a mouse device or keyboard) indicating the user wishes to return to use of the system, the screen saver displays the answer to the question for a predetermined time, and then returns to background mode. Further column 1, lines 32-34 of Lundberg teach that a customizable screen saver program that can display information or questions and answers and score the user's performance. When the program goes into the screen saver mode a question (or information) is displayed from a set of questions (or units of information).

Claim 50 of the present invention teaches a Screen Saver Module that allows a user to display the data in the databank in the form of a screen saver on the user's computer. While it is accepted that Lundberg teaches the creation of a screen saver program from a database of questions and answers, it can be inferred that this program is 'dynamic' and requires some form of input by the user. This is not taught by claim 50 of the present invention. Hence, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 50 of the present invention is distinct and inventive over Lundberg even though considered with Sonnenfeld.

8. Claim 51

In Para 14, the Office has rejected Claim 51 as obvious under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonnenfeld in view of Parry and further in view of Sweitzer.

The office action states that Sonnenfeld in view, Parry teaches the invention as discussed above. In addition, Parry teaches the use of flash cards (column 13 lines 13-15). However, Sonnenfeld in view of Parry fails to teach the following limitations as taught by Sweitzer: a utility, which allows the user to print worksheets from the data in the databank (column 4 lines 9-13). The office action states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sonnenfeld in view of Parry invention further in view of Sweitzer in order to provide a system for producing tests with the capability of formatting mathematical expressions that be printed and displayed in a uniform manner as taught by Sweitzer (column 2 lines 45-48).

Claim 51 of the present invention reads as, "The system according to claim 25 further includes a utility which allows the user to print flash cards, snap cards, and worksheets from

the data in the databank”. As mentioned by the Office, column 13, lines 13-15 of Parry teach the use of Flash Cards where a vocabulary item is displayed along with the native language translation, which can be selectively removed from display. Further, column 4 lines 9-13 of Sweitzer teach a print engine module that processes worksheets and produces screen displays or printed tests. The print engine module follows a list of headers, problems, annotations, and footers on a worksheet to generate a unique test for each student. Further, column 2 lines 45-48 of Sweitzer teach a system for producing tests or examinations with the capability of formatting mathematical expressions so that they may be printed and displayed in a uniform manner.

The present invention claims a utility, which allows the user to print study-aids like flash cards, snap cards, and worksheets from the data in the databank. This utility is provided in view of the widely accepted fact that worksheets, workbooks, guidebooks, flash cards, and other such supplementary material present curriculum in the form of questions and answers, and are part of helping students evaluate themselves. It goes without saying, therefore, that such self-study by means of questions and answers is a very useful tool to revise and remember what has been studied.

While it is accepted that both Parry and Sweitzer teach the use of flash cards and worksheets respectively, it should be noted that the present invention employs a method different from that of Parry and Sweitzer for the purpose of printing flash cards and worksheets. That is, the user can find questions by none or one or more “FIND” conditions, sort and make a selection of the questions in the find result, and choose to print the selected questions in the form of flash cards, snap cards, and/or worksheets. This method cannot be inferred from the teachings of Parry and Sweitzer. Hence, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 51 of the present invention is distinct, novel and inventive over Sonnenfeld in view of Parry.

9. Claim 52

In Para 15, the office has rejected Claim 52 and states that Claim 52 is obvious under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonnenfeld in view of Naughton. Sonnenfeld teaches the invention as discussed above. In addition, Sonnenfeld further teaches the modules

and utilities are adapted to be operated within a browser (column 12 lines 42-47), other viewing and/or processing programs and to operate on computers (column 12 lines 55-65).

The office action states that however, Sonnenfeld fails to teach the following claimed limitations as taught by Naughton: utilities are adapted to be operated within hand held devices (column 3 lines 65-67 and column 4 lines 1-12). The office action also states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Sonnenfeld's invention in view of Naughton in order to provide an intuitive graphical user interface displayed on a hand-held display device as taught by Naughton (column 3 lines 21-24).

Claim 52 of the present invention reads as, "The system according to claim 25 wherein the modules and utilities are adapted to be operated within a browser and/or other viewing and/or processing programs and to operate on one or more computers, including hand held devices". The applicant states that column 12; lines 42-47 of Sonnenfeld teach that a preferred embodiment according to Sonnenfeld is provided in an Internet-based worldwide web browser client, web server environment. The test definition is hosted on a central web server, which is capable of defining web pages on demand, and which provides both supervisory and user interfaces through the network interface. Further column 12, lines 55-65 of Sonnenfeld teach a computer software system, called the "Interactive Testing And Questionnaire System" (ITS), which allows for the interactive and secure development and production of tests over the Internet using a standard web browser. The ITS server runs with any standard ODBC compliant database and any standard web server that runs on the Windows, TM, Operating System. Once the ITS server is running, however, all that is needed to design and develop tests is any web browser running on any platform.

Further column 3, lines 65-67 and column 4, lines 1-12 of Naughton teach that to control real world remote devices, many of the graphic objects presented on the screen are associated with remote devices in the real world. To control a remote device, a user selects the graphic object pictured on the display screen associated with the particular remote device. After the user selects a graphic object associated with a remote device, the hand-held display device displays a user interface for controlling the remote device. The user can then interact with the remote device's user interface. To control the remote device, the present invention

invokes a device driver method for the remote device. The device driver method may be located within the remote device or within the local hand-held display device, depending on the remote device's sophistication.

Further, column 3 lines 21-24 of Naughton teach an intuitive graphical user interface and a method and apparatus for controlling remote devices. The graphical user interface of the present invention is displayed on a hand-held display device.

The present invention teaches that one or more of its modules and utilities are adapted to be operated within a browser and/or other viewing and/or processing programs and to operate on one or more computers, including hand held devices.

While it is accepted that both Sonnenfeld and Naughton provide preferred embodiments that are adapted to work in a browser and/or a hand held device, it should be noted that the present invention in its preferred embodiment provides an interactive system for building, organizing, and sharing one's own databank of questions and answers in a variety of questioning formats, on any subject, in one or more languages, using a computer system, comprising of: (a) a User Interface; (b) one or more well-classified databases to store data user wise including a User Database; (c) at least one well classified data input, organizing and management module; (d) modules for sharing, invoking, storing, evaluating, and improving one's knowledge on any subject, using the data from the databank, said data having been selected by a user by finding the same by none or one or more "FIND" conditions; and (e) a control system acting as a bridge between the User Interface and the databases. This however, is not the case with the preferred embodiment of Sonnenfeld, which provides a human response testing system.

Thus, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and state that modifying Sonnenfeld's invention in view of Naughton cannot achieve the same result as the preferred embodiment of the present invention. Hence, the application respectfully disagrees with the Office and maintains that claim 52 of the present invention is distinct, novel and inventive over Sonnenfeld in view of Naughton.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection against claims 25-32,35-40,42,44,48-49 under Section 103(a).

In view of above, the Applicant likes to submit that the Office may please note that no cited prior art alone or in combination teaches a system as claimed in claims 25 -52 which is for building a well classified database of the question-answers for one's general knowledge, for teacher and students, etc., and for finding said questions and answers from the said well classified database easily by using Find conditions. Therefore, Applicant submits that the present invention is novel and inventive over the cited documents.

V. CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the pending claims and the arguments presented herein successfully traverse the rejections of the claims. Allowance of Claims 25-52 is therefore requested. Applicant believes that all of the pending claims should now be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Applicant,

Date: 4/09/2008

/Juneko Jackson/

Otto O. Lee (Reg. No.: 37,871)
Juneko Jackson (Reg. No.: 48,870)
Intellectual Property Law Group LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

Atty Docket No.: KRISHNA.GORADIA.PT1
Contact No.: 408-286-8933